DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 864 CS 208 828

AUTHOR Duke, Charles R.
TITLE A Look at Current State-Wide Text Adoption Procedures.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English Spring Conference (4th, Houston, TX, March 28-30, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Language Arts; National Surveys; Reading Material Selection; *State Standards; *State Surveys; *Textbook Evaluation; *Textbook Research; *Textbook Selection; Textbook Standards
IDENTIFIERS *State Textbook Adoption Policies

ABSTRACT

To determine what procedures and criteria are being used in states with state-wide textbook adoption and to determine what similarities and differences might exist from state to state, state textbook administrators in such states were asked to respond to a 39-item questionnaire and to supply materials that explained their states' procedures and criteria in some detail. An examination of the data revealed several areas of concern, among them that (1) the criteria used for evaluation vary widely and appear not always to relate clearly enough to current instructional practices to be of much value; (2) appropriate training for evaluators in using specific criteria is lacking; (3) the apparent duplication of effort at both state and local levels in evaluating instructional materials raises questions about the efficiency and effectiveness of the process; (4) reviews at the state level do not appear to have much uniformity, and textbook commission members frequently do not do the actual reviewing but pass that task on to friends and colleagues; (5) the translation of evaluators' reviews of text materials into final votes for adoption remains unclear; (6) economic factors seem to be a major influence in states keeping state-wide adoption practices; and (7) no available evidence indicates the optimum time for the reviewing process. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization orginating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED254864

A Look at Current State-Wide Text Adoption Procedures

Charles R. Duke

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles R. Duke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 208 828

A Look at Current State-Wide Text Adoption Procedures

When we realize that between 75 to 95 percent of a student's instructional time is occupied in using textbooks and related materials (Goldstein, 1978; EPIE Institute, 1977), we can begin to understand why textbook selection and adoption procedures excite considerable interest among teachers, administrators, lawmakers, and the general public. When we realize further that "the textbook is the curriculum" in many schools, the procedures and criteria used become especially significant in terms of what impact the final decisions for textbook adoption will have on students' education. This impact is particularly crucial where state-wide adoptions exist.

To determine what procedures and criteria currently are being used in states with state-wide adoption, and to determine what similarities and differences might exist from state to state, state textbook administrators in each such state were asked to respond to a 39 item questionnaire and to supply materials which explained their states' procedures and criteria in some detail. A 100 percent return of the survey and a substantial amount of literature provide the basis for the following analysis.

Twenty-eight states rely upon local districts to select the textbook materials to be used in their schools. The remaining twenty-two states have state-wide textbook adoption:

Alabama	Nevada
Arizona	New Mexico
Arkansas	North Carolina
California	Oklahoma
Florida	Oregon
Georgia	South Carolina
Idaho	Tennessee
Indiana	Texas
Kentucky	Utah
Louisiana	Virginia
Mississippi	West Virginia

Among these twenty-two, nineteen have specific procedures for adoption of K-12 textbook materials; Arizona, California, and Nevada control only the adoption of materials for K-8 at the state level, although in 1985-86 California will begin to select materials for grades 9-12. The survey of the twenty-two states suggests that a fairly wide range of procedures is used, ranging from New Mexico where "the state will adopt almost anything that comes recommended by a local district" to California and Texas, the two largest state-wide adoption states, where procedures and requirements are so specific that publishers tend to pay considerable attention to meeting the requirements for these two markets, assuming that what will pass in California and Texas certainly will pass elsewhere in the country (Crane, 1975; Bowler, 1978). That assumption seems to be supported by the collected data.

Textbook Committees or Commissions

Each adoption state except Nevada and New Mexico has some type of a state-wide committee charged with the responsibility of determining how textbooks will be purchased and what criteria the books must meet in order to be placed on the state's approved adoption list. In only Mississippi and Oklahoma do these committees act independently from the State Board of Education; in all other states, the committees or commissions make their recommendations to the State Board of Education for final action. Committee size among the states has a mean of 15 members and a median of 18.7. West Virginia has the largest with 30 members and Mississippi the smallest with 6. Size, however, is deceptive. Many of the commissions involve additional people in the process. For example, in Indiana each of the seven commissioners is entitled by law to "select an evaluation team made up of school administrators, teachers, and parents." The law does not stipulate the exact number of people in each of these teams; hence, a

commissioner can involve as many people in the adoption process as seems feasible. Comments from survey respondents suggest that this practice is quite common although Texas, for example, does specify the maximum number--6 for each committee member.

The membership of the main textbook committees, however, reflects an attempt to represent a cross-section of the educational and lay communities. Educators at all levels from elementary through college predominate but lay people hold membership on all the state adoption committees. In no state are committee members elected. In California, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Tennessee the members are appointed by the governor; in eight other states, the State Board of Education makes the selections, while in four others, the state superintendent or commissioner of education makes the selection; in another three states, the governor and the state board of education or the superintendent of public instruction each is given the responsibility for selecting a certain number of members for the committees. New Mexico and Nevada rely upon local districts to make their own selections for local committees, since no state-wide committee exists in those states. State committee members serve a mean of 2.7 years with the median being 3.4 years. Several states use staggered terms, but most states do not appear to have this provision.

The Adoption Process

The length of the adoption process varies. For the 17 states taking 12 months or less, the median is 8 months. Only California, Florida, Oklahoma, Oregon, and West Virginia take more than 12 months. Indiana, on the other hand, completes its process in three or four months. The length of the process becomes an important factor when one considers the logistics involved. Textbook commission members have to be selected, publishers have to be notified of the adoption subject areas and specifications, books have

to be delivered to the reviewers and made available to the public, hearings have to be held, the reviews have to be made, recommendations determined, and a final list approved. To ease the burden on publishers and committee members, all states have adoption cycles so not all grade levels or subject areas are reviewed at the same time. The number of books to be considered in this process varies, of course, but in Arizona, South Carolina and Texas where no more than 3-5 titles can be placed on the adoption list in a particular subject category, the time spent in narrowing the choices can be considerable. The mean for the number of titles to be placed on the approved list is 8.6; the median is 10. Nine states have no limit. All approved books are adopted for contract cycles which have a nation-wide mean of 5.4 years and median of 5.

During the process, in all states except Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina and Utah, public hearings are held prior to adoption where citizens may register their approval or disapproval of specific texts. Fourteen respondents to the survey indicated that professional organizations such as affiliates of NCTE or IRA had opportunities for input during the review process; however, in only five cases did the respondents indicate that these organizations regularly make use of these opportunities. Several textbook administrators suggested that members of the textbook committees also might be members of such organizations, but no conscious attempt is made to include such representation. Most states also have centers where the books can be reviewed by the public as well as educators. California, for example, maintains Instructional Materials Display Centers (IMDCs) in which up-to-date collections of all state-adopted textbooks are housed; these IMDCs provide such services as circulating sets of materials to school systems for review, providing the sites for evaluation of materials, and providing the public with ready

access to state-approved curriculum materials.

All states have procedures to guarantee the public access to materials being considered for adoption. In California, for example, the public is given the opportunity to review the materials and to respond on "public comment" forms which then are considered by the appropriate review committee or panel. In Texas, any resident may submit comments "for, against, about, or upon a book or books, learning system, or supplementary materials submitted for adoption." Texas residents also may appear at public hearings and provide oral testimony but must notify the commissioner of education in writing on or prior to the date of the hearing. The commissioner of education, who establishes the procedures for the hearings, may limit the number of people allowed to speak on behalf of any one organization. Transcripts of the hearings are made and publishers may request sections pertaining to their texts. During a 21 day period following a hearing, citizens who participated in the hearing or any official representative of a publishing company may submit written testimony pertaining to any section of the transcript. How much influence public testimony has on commission members' final decisions in any state is difficult to determine. Courtland (1983) suggests that the effect may be minimal.

The final approval of what materials will be placed on the state adoption list rests with the State Board of Education in each state except Mississippi and Oklahoma where the state textbook commission makes the final decision. In all states except Arkansas the final decisions are made in public meetings, but the voting procedure for placing a title on the final list varies widely and is apparently determined by the committees. In several cases, the textbook administrators did not appear to know what procedure was used or chose not to reveal it. In Tennessee, Oregon, and West Virginia, a simple majority vote is adequate; in Florida, Texas and

South Carolina, a two-thirds vote of the committee members is required; in Indiana, all materials receiving at least 7 votes on the first ballot are accepted. Georgia's textbook committee establishes a cut-off score on a scale of 1-100 and a majority of the committee must affirm a score above the cut-off. In New Mexico, almost any materials are adopted which have been recommended by a local district; in Alabama, materials are accepted as long as they clearly will serve to implement the course of study; only in North Carolina is the actual voting kept confidential.

Once materials have been approved and placed on the adoption list, school districts receive the list and then decide on the materials they want. In only 9 states are the lists annotated with anything beyond basic purchasing information. If such annotations appear, the authors are either the members of the textbook commission itself or the subject area specialist in the State Office of Education. Both groups usually receive assistance from publishers, but the amount and type of information in the annotations can vary widely from state to state. For example, annotations like the following appear in Florida's 1984-1985 Catalog of State Adopted Instructional Materials:

Macmillan — Loban et al.
Grammar and Writing. 1st ed., 1981:

77-610-0 GRADE 9 TEXTBOOK	$8.40
77-610-1 Teacher Edition.	11.47
77-611-0 Worktext	3.60
77-612-0 GRADE 10 TEXTBOOK.	8.76
77-612-1 Teacher Edition.	12.00
77-613-1 Worktext	3.60
77-614-0 GRADE 11 TEXTBOOK.	8.91
77-614-1 Teacher Edition.	12.36
77-615-0 Worktext	3.96
77-616-0 GRADE 12 TEXTBOOK.	9.09
77-616-1 Teacher Edition	12.51
77-617-0 Worktext	3.96

Related materials: Teachers' editions of worktexts, free with class orders.
Approach: Sequential and spiral; traditional.
Suitable for students reading on grade level and below, grades 9-12.
Suggested teaching time: one year, each book; format makes the texts

flexible for courses of varying length.
Adopted 1982-88.

In North Carolina, the annotation for the same series runs ten pages and covers the following areas: intended audience, the philosophy behind the series, the organizational pattern for the series, and a highlighting of sections appropriate for the better students. The annotation also includes samples of specific language problems and how the texts address them, a discussion of the ways writing connects with language skills in the series, and a discussion of the evaluation program for the series.

Most states, however, simply list the titles, publishers, and prices for the adopted materials. Such a listing provides little information for local districts to use when they must choose from multiple titles--the case in all of the states which use state-wide adoption for grades 7-12. Those individuals at the district level charged with the responsibility for selecting instructional materials, therefore, may have considerable information to work with or none at all. Each district has to perform its own evaluation in whatever way it chooses although in some states, such as Florida, the district superintendent must by law conduct an evaluation of each piece of instructional material that will be requisitioned. Evidence must be presented that the material is appropriate, acceptable and usable in the district's schools before students receive it. Each district's evaluations go on file and can be called for at any time by the State Board of Education. Most states, however, do not have even this policy, leaving the local districts free to decide whether they will evaluate the materials prior to requisitioning them and if so, how the evaluation will be done.

The Criteria

The materials which will be considered for adoption vary but generally are confined to textbooks and may include titles of individual texts for

each grade level, a series of textbooks for a combination of grade levels or single titles designed for multiple grade use. A much broader group of materials, however, such as that defined by Florida law, may be considered in some states:

> ...items that by design serve as a major tool for assisting in the instruction of a subject, or course. These items may be available in bound, unbound, kit, or package form, and may consist of hard or softback textbooks, consumables, learning laboratories, slides, films and filmstrips, recordings, manipulatives, and other commonly accepted instructional tools.
> (Florida Statutes 233.07(4)

Although all states have some type of criteria for textbooks, only Kentucky, Oklahoma and Tennessee have separate criteria for ancillary materials such as software and audio-visual materials. However, unless those materials are on the adoption list, few states have the freedom to use state textbook money allocations for such purchases and those that do must spend less than 25% of their allocation in this way except in Florida where school districts may use up to 50% of their textbook allocation, providing they file evidence of how the materials meet the state guidelines.

In the adoption process, the key element is the criteria used for selecting appropriate text materials. Only Utah and Mississippi do not update their criteria each time a new adoption cycle begins. The criteria may be of a generic type, suitable for use with any text material, or it may be subject oriented, such as with language arts materials. The author for either type of criteria usually will be the textbook commission and/or the state department of education. Seventeen states have general criteria required for all materials K-12; Arizona and Nevada have such criteria only for K-8. Although generic criteria vary slightly from state to state, generally they reflect the topics such as those from New Mexico which are seen in Figure 1. (Insert Figure 1 here)

One area addressed in each state's generic criteria is that of objectionable content. In Utah, for example, guidelines call for exclusion from school programs any of the following topics or areas:

1. The intricacies of intercourse, sexual stimulation, erotic behavior, etc.
2. The acceptance of or advocacy of homosexuality as a desirable or acceptable sexual adjustment or lifestyle.
3. A position of advocacy of or "how to do it" approaches to contraceptive techniques and devices.
4. The acceptance of or advocacy of "free sex," promiscuity, or so-called "new morality."

States such as Texas and California have generic criteria which not only address these issues but also call for the inclusion of certain values. Texas, for example, requires that textbooks "shall treat divergent groups fairly without stereotyping and reflect the positive contributions of all individuals and groups to the American way of life." Included under this general statement are such directives as "textbook content shall not encourage life styles deviant from generally accepted standards of society" and "the book shall present examples of men and women participating in a variety of roles and activities and shall further present the economic, political, social, and cultural contributions of both men and women, past and present." Texas law further stipulates that "textbook content and suggested readings which are in violation of the content requirements and limitations. . . shall be deleted from any adopted textbook and teacher guide, edition, or manual or other material adopted. . . ."

In California, a committee separate from the textbook committee is charged with determining whether materials submitted for adoption are in legal compliance with specified content requirements. This committee reviews materials for portrayals of the following:

male and female roles
older persons and the aging process
religion
dangerous substances
Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of United States
ethnic and cultural groups
disabled persons
entrepreneurship and labor
ecology and environment
thrift, fire prevention, and humane treatment of animals and people
brand names and corporate logos
foods

In California if materials are found not to be in compliance, a publisher has two choices of action: revise the material to meet the legal mandates of the state or appeal the finding of noncompliance. The appeal can be made at two levels; first, to a panel comprised of adult citizens; second, to a panel of members of the State Board of Education. No materials that have been cited for noncompliance can be adopted unless the appeal is upheld or the material revised. No other states, besides Texas and California, have such detailed requirements, relying instead on more general language to take care of this aspect of the evaluation process.

As Muther (1984) has indicated, generic criteria although somewhat useful in the broadest of evaluations do not offer much assistance for evaluating materials in a specific content area. Some states, such as Mississippi which relies on the generic criteria for ratings of text materials, acknowledge that evaluators need to find other criteria to use:

> Specific evaluative criteria which is applicable to all the areas is difficult to develop. Therefore, only criteria which may be useful, generally, is included. . . . If committee members have criteria for evaluating textbooks in their area of expertise, it is suggested that these be utilized, also, in the rating process. --1984 Mississippi Textbook Administration Handbook

Fifteen states have published criteria for each subject area, K-12. In some cases these criteria will be program or course of study standards; in other instances, the criteria are separate from the standards but clearly related. In large subject areas, such as language arts, fifteen states divide the area into smaller units; for example, Kentucky divides the area of language arts for grades 7-12 into English, reading, oral

communication, dramatics, journalism, media, composition, and functional language arts, while literature is in a category by itself. In some states, areas are clustered and put on separate adoption cycles. West Virginia divides English/language arts into literature and reading for one adoption cycle while another cycle takes composition, grammar, and oral communication. Idaho has one cycle for English grammar and composition, another for drama and speech, another for literature, and still another for reading.

The form as well as the content of the criteria used for specific subject areas vary greatly from state to state. Nowhere is that more evident than in English/language arts, grades 7-12. Many of the states refer evaluators, as well as publishers, to "standards" for the different courses offered in the schools such as those seen in Figure 2 for American literature courses in Florida high schools.

Other states, such as Oregon and Virginia, use the generic criteria plus a separate rating scale to develop evaluations of materials in specific subject areas. These scales range from several pages in length--Virginia--to the one page subject area scale used by Oregon in 1980 (See Figure 3).

Although the criteria exist, ten states provide no training for evaluators in the use of such criteria. The remaining twelve states offer sessions which range from one to two days. Typically in these sessions, which are conducted by the state office of education staff, evaluators receive information about the responsibilities of a textbook committee member, the adoption process--usually the time line--regulations about dealings with publishers and their representatives, and other legal requirements. In most cases, evaluators do not appear to receive training in applying criteria to actual sample texts and in almost all cases

evaluators do not meet again as a group to review materials or to compare findings. In fact, no provision seems to exist by which reviewers are informed how their ratings on specific texts compared with those of other reviewers. The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) recommended that "consumer information services" be readily available for anyone purchasing instructional materials. Such information does not seem to be provided to reviewers in adoption states other than California, although the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE) presently is producing such material. Courtland (1983) reports this lack of training and adequate communication during the review process to be a source of frustration for people going through the process for the first time.

The Publishing and Financial Connection

Although the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) reported that there has been a 50 percent decline in textbook spending over the past seven years, publishing school texts is a highly competitive yet lucrative business. The national average in 1981 for sales per capita was $20.63; that represents a $4.25 increase over the average in 1978. (See Figure 4 for how states with state-wide adoptions rank in per capita sales). Publishers, therefore, take adoption cycles seriously and stand to gain or lose a considerable amount of money on the basis of how their books are evaluated. An added incentive for paying attention to states with adoption cycles is that California and Texas are in that group and represent major markets. California alone represents ten percent of the country's text-book market (California State Department of Education, 1984). The percentage of state appropriations for educational instruction used for the purchase of textbooks and other instructional media from a low

of one and a half percent in Arkansas to 40-50 percent in Oklahoma. The basis for textbook allocations varies also. Eight states base their allocations on average daily attendance while seven states use total student population to determine allocations. In other states, local districts make the decision about allocations, since no state-wide formula exists.

Because of the high financial stakes, most states have strict policies governing the behavior of publishers and their representatives as well as textbook evaluators during the adoption process. All states except Utah permit publishers to make presentations to textbook commission members; however, these presentations are tightly controlled and variations from the approved procedures can be just cause for a publisher's materials to be removed from consideration. In addition, any people involved in the adoption process who accept bribes or gifts can expect to face criminal charges. In West Virginia, for example, a conviction on such charges can carry with it confinement in the state penitentiary for not less than one year and not more than three. Eight states permit publishers to pilot instructional materials in local districts prior to adoption; however, the remaining states have no provision for this or may, as in the case of Virginia, expressly discourage it:

> The piloting of instructional materials in localities prior to the adoption of such materials is often used for the purpose of influencing localities and/or the State in the adoption process. Therefore, the Board of Education is on record as discouraging this practice and advising localities to carefully evaluate the purposes of piloting instructional materials.

Specific penalties are built into the states' bidding and contract procedures to insure that obligations are met. In most cases, publishers whose materials are adopted must have depositories in the state where sufficient supplies of texts are available at all times. Contract prices

ordinarily are not permitted to rise during the life of the adoption cycle although some states permit companies to raise their prices after two or three years elapse in the cycle to keep pace with inflation.

Some Final Considerations

Textbook administrators from each of the 22 states were invited to comment on what they perceived to be the strengths of the adoption process in their states. Most frequently mentioned were economic factors: controlled prices of materials over a set time; assurance of service by publishers; and centralized bidding and purchasing. A second category of responses focused upon the process itself and most frequently included references to qualified reviewers; strong criteria; involvement of the public and the education communities; and emphasis upon keeping curriculum up-to-date.

When asked to identify the weaknesses in their present systems, textbook administrators most often cited: lack of communication among evaluators; the absence of appropriate training for evaluators; the shortness of time for evaluators to deal with the huge quantities of materials that had to be reviewed; the length of the adoption cycle; the number of materials accepted (either too few or too many); and the inadequate funding for textbook purchasing.

An examination of the data from the survey and the accompanying materials suggest several areas of concern:

1. The criteria used for evaluation vary widely and appear not always to relate clearly enough to current instructional practices to be of much value; forms and procedures for recording evaluations are not always clear.

2. Appropriate training for evaluators in using specific criteria is clearly lacking.

3. The apparent duplication of effort at both state and local levels in evaluating instructional materials raises questions about the efficiency and effectiveness of the process.

4. Reviews at the state level appear not to have much uniformity and textbook commission members themselves frequently do not do the actual reviewing but pass that task on to friends, colleagues and others; yet these same commission members make the final recommendations for adoption.

5. The translation of evaluators' reviews of text materials into final votes for adoption remains unclear in most states.

6. Time is a clear factor in the adoption process yet no evidence is available to indicate what the optimum time might be for the reviewing process or for the length of the adoption cycle.

7. Economic factors seem to be a major influence in states keeping state-wide adoption practices.

These and other aspects of the adoption process need further study. A recent Gallup poll (Education USA, 1984) found that 39 percent of the teachers sampled believe they should have the most influence in deciding what is taught and 79 percent said they should govern book selection. If they are to exercise that choice, teachers need to be as well informed as possible about how the adoption process works in their states and need to take leadership through their professional organizations to insure that valid criteria are used, that current instructional theory and practice are reflected in final choices, and that textbook commissions are held accountable for establishing clear, uniform practices of evaluation that can be easily understood by all citizens of the state. After all, if the textbook is, indeed, the curriculum in most schools, everyone needs to be sure that what is selected reflects the best possible knowledge we have about teaching and about how students learn best from instructional materials.

References

Bowler, M. Texas publishers try to please all, but first they woo the heart of Texas. The Reading Teacher, 1978, 31, 514-518.

California State Department of Education. Instructional materials sunset review report, Sacramento, 1984.

Courtland, M.; Farr, R; Harris, P; Tarr, J.; and Treece, L. A case study of the Indiana state reading textbook adoption process. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1983.

Crane, B., The 'California effect' on textbook adoptions. Educational Leadership, (January 1975): 283-285.

EPIE Institute. "Report on a national study of the nature and the quality of instructional materials most used by teachers and learners." EPIE Report (1977).

Goldstein, P., Changing the American textbook: law, politics and technology. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1978.

More of what teachers believe. Education USA, 31 December 1983, p. 135.

Muther, C. The skills trace. Educational Leadership, 1984, 42, 3, 82-85; see also C. Muther, Reviewing research when choosing materials." Educational Leadership 1985, 42, 5, 86-87.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A nation at risk. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1983.

Tulley, M. A descriptive study of perceived intended benefits of state textbook adoption policies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, 1983.

FIGURE 1

GENERAL EVALUATION FORM

Print Material _____
Non–Print Material _____
Computer Software _____

Adopt _____
Do Not Adopt _____
Percentile Rank _____

SUBJECT AREA _____ SUBCATEGORY _____

AUTHOR _____ TITLE _____

PUBLISHER _____ COPYRIGHT _____ NEW _____ REVISED _____

Level of Intended Use
or Readability-Publisher (Circle) K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 ABE

Level of Recommended Use
or Readability-Evaluator (Circle) K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 ABE

If an attribute listed below does not apply to a specific item, rate it NA.

	Rating Scale					
	Poor					Excellent
	NA	1	2	3	4	5
1. Physical Characteristics						
Paper quality, binding, print size, illustrations						
Construction, durability, appearance						
Suitable and durable storage container provided						
Quality of sound (where applicable)						
Quality of color (where applicable)						
2. Objectives						
Clearly stated						
Congruent with topic						
Adequate						
3. Instructional Application						
Multi-level learning within self-contained classroom						
Student involvement						
Enrichment or extension of student competencies						
Correlation with other subjects						
Usable by inexperienced teacher						
Individualized instruction						
Student-initiated activities						
Evaluation components included						
4. Content Evaluation where applicable						
Appropriate for target group						
Accurate						
Comprehensive						
Suggests continuing learning experience						
Aids conceptual development						
Develops critical thinking						
Well written						
5. Scope and Sequence						
Essential skills included and appropriate for level of intended use						
TM Practical, concise in directions, manageable in use and size						
6. Treatment of Culturally Sensitive Material						
Race						
Sex						
Religion						
Other (Specify)						

Total Points Possible _____
Total points Received _____

Figure 2

American Literature

1. COURSE DESCRIPTION

   This course is a study of selected American literary works of various genre in relationship to the development of the distinctive qualities of the national literature.

2. DESIRED APPROACH OF CONDUCT

   Since no single approach will meet the needs of all classes in literature, a variety of approaches is desirable.

3. MAJOR EMPHASIS TO BE COVERED

   a. Developmental reading activities should be related to the selections.

   b. Thinking, speaking and writing experiences should be included where applicable.

   c. Content may focus upon the political, cultural, social and historical forces in America as reflected in its literature.

   d. Content may also include the tenets and characteristics of Puritan, transcendental, romantic, realistic, naturalistic, modern, and contempory literar, movements.

   e. Course activities may include frequent writing assignments based upon literature emphasizing the development of insight and critical judgment.

4. LEVEL OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

   a. Instructional materials will be used in grades 7-12.

   b. The Council's (textbook council) recommendations will be based upon the needs of the students reading on, above, or below grade level.

5. SPECIAL NEEDS

   a. Teacher's manuals and editions must be available. Related materials such as tests, answer keys, transparencies, ditto masters, worksheets, posters, audio visual materials and other electronic media are desirable and should be available.

   b. It is recommended that the application of FLORIDA MINIMUM STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS IN READING AND WRITING be correlated with individual selections and/or activities wherever possible.

   c. It is recommended that the application of STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE IN WRITING be correlated with individual selections and/or activities wherever possible.

Figure 3

Specific Content Criteria for the Selection and Adoption of Textbooks for Communication: Written Composition--Grades 7-12

Rating Scale:

Excellent	= 20
Above Average	= 15
Average	= 10
Below Average	= 5
Inadequate	= 0

The Written Composition text(s)

1. gives primary emphasis to written communication _____

2. encourages and provides for extensive student writing _____

3. integrates reading, listening, speaking and writing _____

4. emphasizes all aspects of the writing process including _____
   - prewriting activities
   - writing activities
   - editing and revising activities

5. includes fundamental instruction, relating to all aspects _____
   of the writing process in
   - rhetoric--such as vocabulary and diction, selecting and limiting topics, organization and development, and sentence style
   - grammar--not in isolation, but integrated in the composing process, such as in sentence combining exercises, etc.
   - mechanical and transcriptive skills--such as spelling, punctuation, and capitalization

6. includes activities and assignments in the various modes of _____
   discourse: personal expression, description, narration, exposition, persuasion, and argumentation

7. provides appropriate and clearly stated diagnostic and _____
   prescriptive techniques

SPECIFIC CRITERIA TOTAL POINTS: _____
(Highest possible total: 140)

FIGURE 4

ESTIMATED INDUSTRY SALES OF ELEMENTARY AND HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS

1978			1979		
State	Sales Per Capita	Rank	State	Sales Per Capita	Rank
Oklahoma	24.84	1	Arizona	29.01	1
South Carolina	22.43	3	Nevada	23.12	8
Arizona	20.43	11	Arkansas	22.83	11
Nevada	19.95	12	North Carolina	22.65	13
Indiana	19.30	14	Kentucky	22.41	14
Arkansas	18.55	16	South Carolina	20.99	19
Kentucky	17.98	22	New Mexico	20.75	21
Oregon	17.30	24	Virginia	20.45	24
National Average	16.38		Texas	19.00	27
Georgia	16.27	29	**National Average**	18.62	
North Carolina	15.99	30	Georgia	18.31	30
Utah	15.48	35	Oklahoma	18.30	31
Virginia	15.31	37	Oregon	18.30	32
California	15.12	38	Florida	17.91	34
Florida	14.53	42	Alabama	16.48	39
Mississippi	14.51	43	Utah	16.47	40
Idaho	14.45	44	Indiana	15.92	44
Alabama	13.78	45	Louisiana	15.91	45
West Virginia	13.50	46	California	15.80	47
Texas	13.41	47	Tennessee	15.49	48
Tennessee	13.19	48	Mississippi	15.00	49
Louisiana	12.29	50	Idaho	14.16	50
New Mexico	11.92	51	West Virginia	14.02	51

Source: Association of American Publishers

FIGURE 4 (continued)

ESTIMATED INDUSTRY SALES OF ELEMENTARY AND HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS

1980			1981		
State	Sales Per Capita	Rank	State	Sales Per Capita	Rank
Arizona	29.01	1	South Carolina	30.60	3
South Carolina	27.90	3	Arizona	27.32	11
Arkansas	24.49	8	Oklahoma	25.92	12
North Carolina	23.99	12	West Virginia	23.53	20
Oklahoma	22.47	15	Nevada	23.01	22
Kentucky	20.86	21	New Mexico	22.71	24
Nevada	20.72	22	Florida	21.48	27
New Mexico	20.05	25	Georgia	20.96	29
Georgia	19.42	29	North Carolina	20.96	30
Florida	19.23	31	**National Average**	20.63	
National Average	19.12		Virginia	20.54	32
Oregon	18.43	32	Oregon	20.04	33
Idaho	18.19	33	Arkansas	19.96	35
Louisiana	17.85	35	California	18.32	39
California	17.82	36	Louisiana	17.81	42
Utah	17.32	40	Texas	16.90	43
Tennessee	16.36	44	Mississippi	16.85	44
Mississippi	16.26	45	Indiana	16.26	45
West Virginia	15.74	46	Idaho	16.07	46
Alabama	15.51	48	Alabama	14.97	48
Virginia	14.85	49	Kentucky	13.46	49
Texas	14.11	50	Utah	13.30	50
Indiana	13.81	51	Tennessee	11.35	51

Source: Association of American Publishers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS, GRADES 7-12, TEXTBOOK ADOPTION SURVEY

Name of person
completing survey: _____(please print)
Position Title: _____
Business Address: _____
_____
_____
Telephone Area Code ____ ___ ____

Directions: The questions which follow ask for information about general textbook adoption procedures and criteria and about their application to text materials for grades 7-12 in English/language arts. We would appreciate detailed and specific answers wherever possible, and any supplementary materials you can send us. Please return this questionnaire and supporting documents by February 15, 1985 to Charles R. Duke, Department of Secondary Education, Utah State University, UMC 28, Logan, UT 84322.

I. Textbook Committee/Commissions

1. Which of the following operates as the main textbook adoption committee for your state?
___ State Board of Education
___ State Department of Education
___ State-wide committee
___ School district committee
___ Individual school committee
___ Other (please describe): _____

2. What is the size of the committee membership? (circle number)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

3. What is the composition of the committee? (indicate number in each category below)
___ lay people
___ classroom teachers
___ principals
___ superintendents
___ district supervisors
___ state department subject area specialist
___ state board of education members
___ other--please identify _____

4. Is the textbook commission/committee independent from the state department of education and/or state board of education? ___ yes ___no

5. How are members placed on the committee?
___ appointed (by whom: _____)
___ elected (by whom: _____)
___ other (explain: _____)

6. How long do committee members serve?
(circle appropriate number of years: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8)

II. Procedures

7. On the average, how long does it take from start to finish to complete the process for placing materials on the final adoption list? (circle appropriate number of months:
   3 or less, 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 More

8. What is the maximum number of titles that can be placed on the approved adoption list for English/language arts(circle appropriate number below:
   3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 More)

9. Does your state publish an annotated list of approved materials in English/language arts? ___ yes ___no

10. If such a list is published, who writes the annotations?
    ___ publishers
    ___ state subject area supervisor
    ___ textbook committee
    ___ selected classroom teachers
    ___ other (please specify: _____)

11. For how many years does an adoption contract or cycle in English/language arts run?
    (Circle appropriate number: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10)

12. Does the state provide training sessions for evaluators prior to their actual evaluation of materials? ___yes ___no

13. If yes (no. 12), how many are there, what are their length, and who conducts them?

14. Do professional associations such as local and state affiliates of the National Council of Teachers of English and the International Reading Association have any opportunities for input to the evaluation process? ___yes ___no

15. If such opportunities exist, do these organizations regularly contribute input? ___yes ___no (if no, why do you think this happens)?

16. Are public hearings held prior to final adoption of materials?
    ___yes ___no

17. Do provisions exist for pilot testing of materials by school districts prior to adoption? ___yes ___no

18. Who approves the final list of adopted materials?
___ State Textbook Committee/Commission
___ State Board of Education
___ State Department of Education
___ other (please identify: _____)

19. Are decisions on final adoptions made in meeting(s) open to the public? ___yes ___no

III. Criteria

20. Are there general criteria required of all materials K-12?
___yes ___no (If yes, please attach copy of such criteria)

21. Does the state publish a statement of goals and/or criteria for each subject area? ___yes ___no (if yes, please attach copy for all English/language arts areas, grades 7-12)

22. Does your state divide English/language arts, Grades 7-12, into separate areas, each with its own adoption cycle and criteria?
___yes ___no (Please list the separate areas below, and if areas are not covered by request in No. 20, attach criteria)

23. Who writes the criteria to be used in evaluating materials?
___ state textbook committee/commission
___ State Board of Education
___ State Department of Education
___ District committees
___ Other (please specify: _____)

24. Are criteria and rating scales, if used, up-dated whenever materials are being considered for a new adoption period? ___yes ___no

25. Are separate criteria used for evaluating ancillary materials (computer software, tapes, films, transparencies, etc.)?
___yes ___no (If yes, please attach copy of such criteria)

26. Are titles of individual texts for each grade level considered?
___yes ___no

27. Are titles in a series for any combination of grade levels considered?
___yes ___no

28. Are single titles designed for multiple grade use considered?
___yes ___no

29. Please explain as clearly as possible what is required for a title to be placed on the final approved list of adopted materials. (number of votes, rating, etc.)

IV. Publishers

30. Are publishers permitted to make presentations to the textbook adoption committee? ___yes ___no

31. Are publishers restricted from raising prices on materials after they have been adopted? ___yes ___no

32. Are publishers required to supply readability levels for all submitted materials? ___yes ___no

33. Are publishers required to provide evidence that materials have been field tested prior to adoption? ___yes ___no

V. Finances

34. What percent of your state's appropriations for educational instruction goes to textbooks?
___ 0-20%
___ 20-30%
___ 30-40%
___ 40-50%
___ 50-60%
___ 60-70%
___ 70-80%
___ 80-90%
___ 90-100%

35. What percent of the textbook appropriation goes to English or language arts, Grades 7-12?
___ 0-20% ___ 20-30% ___ 30-40% ___ 40-50% ___ 50-60%

36. On what basis are textbook financial allocations determined for each school district?
___ total student populations
___ average daily attendance
___ local school tax allocations
___ other (please explain: _____)

37. What percent of state textbook funds may be used by a district for purchasing instructional materials not on an approved list?
___ none ___less than 25% ___ other (specify: _____)

38. What criteria, if any, do such materials have to meet in order for state funds to be used for their purchase? (Attach copy of criteria or explain here:

VI. Summation

39. Based on your experience/observation of your state textbook adoption procedures and committee(s), what do you perceive as being their greatest strength? their greatest weakness? Feel free to add any other comments which you believe will clarify your state's procedures, especially as they may related to English/language arts. (Your comments will be treated anonymously.) Thank you for your assistance.